

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,306	06/22/2001	Rogelio Robles	10990665-1	6814

7590 08/16/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,306

Applicant(s)

ROBLES ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 6/22/2001.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-40 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 19, and 29 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 6/22/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 32-40 recite the limitation "the document production request" in claim 32, lines 3-

4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "document production request" to refer to in this claim or previous base claims.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Claim 38 recites the limitation "the interface generator" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "interface generator" to refer to in this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

9. Claims 1-18, 24, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Der linden et al, hereinafter Vanderlinden (US Pub.# 2001/0013947 A1, 8/16/2001, filed 12/28/2000).

Regarding independent claim 19, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center using a print driver—*capture driver operable to capture the document production request*, which generates a temporary print file. A submission form, which is displayed by a browser—*interface translator--*, has pull-down menus, and control buttons for selecting printers, and print options, and submitting the print job (0038-0046, fig.,3).

Art Unit: 2178

Furthermore, a reproduction center—*production server--* is connected with a client via a network, for routing the print job according to the selected printers and print options—*direct one or more selected devices to produce the captured document*, to a printer which capable for executing this job. The submission form includes messages for displaying the change in devices capabilities—*potential services* offered by the reproduction center--as a result of automatic updates of the submission form. A scheduler—*production engine--* routes the print jobs to the appropriate printers to complete the job (0035, 0042-0044, 0048-0049,0059-0060).

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center using a print driver, which generates a temporary print file version of the document (in Postscript printer language) to be printed. Once entries have been made, the submission form is transmitted to the reproduction center (0046-0048).

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs, using a submission form, to a reproduction center by a client computer over a network. The submission form is displayed by a browser—*interface translator--* (0035-0041, fig.,3).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Vanderlinden discloses the automatic update—*identify services available on the network--* of the submission form to include a description outlining change in devices capabilities (0051, 0059,fig.3).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 21, Vanderlinden discloses the use or query of a device capability store—*database of known services*-- for automatically updating the submission form to include a description outlining change in devices capabilities (0051, 0059,fig.3).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 19, Vanderlinden teaches the editing or changing of the submission form's pull-down menu—*device identifier to identify* printers available at the reproduction center-- to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu for selecting the printer, as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent. The updated information is placed, and displayed in the form's pull-down menu using a browser (0016, 0041, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 19, Vanderlinden discloses that the reproduction center has a print queue for placing waiting-to-be-processed print jobs (0056,fig.3).

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Vanderlinden discloses that the reproduction center has an operator console for displaying waiting-to-be-processed print jobs from the print queue (0056,fig.3).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 19, Vanderlinden discloses a program module for establishing a network connection with the reproduction center—*locating a print server* (0040).

Regarding independent claim 29, Vanderlinden discloses a print server computer—*second computing device--* is connected to a client computer—*first computing device--* via a network, for routing the print job according to selected printers—*document production devices--* and print options, to a printer which capable for executing this job. The print job is sent to the printer and printed in a PDF format—*device specific format* (0035-0041, 0048-0050, 0059-0060, fig.1-2).

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 29, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center using a print driver. An activation of the driver generates a temporary print file version of the document (in Postscript printer language) to be printed. The print file is transferred to the reproduction center to be printed. A submission form displayed on a browser—*Interface Translator--*, having buttons, and menus for formatting the document which is to be printed (0037-0048, fig.3).

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 30, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center using a print driver. An activation of the driver generates a temporary print file version of the document (in Postscript printer language—*generic format*) to

Art Unit: 2178

be printed. The print file is transferred to the reproduction center to be printed (0037-0041, fig.1-2).

Regarding claim 32, which depends on claim 29, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities—*potential services* offered by the reproduction center--as a result of automatic updates of the submission form. A scheduler—*production engine*-- routes the print jobs to the appropriate printers to complete the job (0035, 0042-0044, 0048-0049,0059-0060).

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 32, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center's print server, using a submission form. The submission form is displayed on a browser—*Interface Translator*--, having buttons, and menus for formatting the document which is to be transferred printed (0041-0048, fig.1-3).

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 32, Vanderlinden discloses the use or query of a device capability store—*services database* -- for automatically updating the submission form to include a description outlining change in devices capabilities. The device capability store is also used for routing the documents to be printed (0051, 0059,fig.3).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 34, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of

Art Unit: 2178

updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not currently represented in this database--* (0059-0060).

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Vanderlinden discloses the update or addition—*identification new devices--* of new printers to a device capabilities store. Each printer is associated with a corresponding print driver (0037-0038, 0051, and 0059).

Claims 38-40 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 25, and 27-28 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-18, 24, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderlinden.

Regarding independent claim 1, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center, where documents are to be printed upon the receipt of a submission form.

Art Unit: 2178

The submission is transmitted by a client—*first computing device*-- through a submission form—*production request*—which indicates controls for allowing a user to select print options—*services*-- currently available at the reproduction center (0010, 0016, fig.1-2, 3).

Furthermore, Vanderlinden teaches creating a job ticket, containing job specifications—*merging selected services and captured document production request into a production plan*-- found on the form submitted by the client. The print job ticket—*production plan*-- is then routed to a printer capable of printing the document (0011, 0050, 0060, fig.3). Vanderlinden fails to explicitly disclose: *delivering the document production plan in a device specific format*.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have delivered the plan in a device specific format, because Vanderlinden teaches above routing job tickets to a printer capable of executing the job at the lowest possible costs. Thus printing documents at a minimum price at a printer which understands and is able to carry out the print request.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0051).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a

Art Unit: 2178

new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0051).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0051). In other words, when the new printer is detected or queried by the client computer, then the update will take place on the submission form.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent. The updated printer information is obtained from a device capability store—*querying a service database* (0051, 0059).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the conversion of a document submitted by the client, into a format, such as PDF—*generic format*-- which is more suitable for processing by the reproduction center (0051). In other words, when the new printer is detected or queried by the client computer, then the update will take place on the submission form.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu for selecting the printer, as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0016, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the display of a list of all pending print jobs along with their current status, such as waiting, being printed, or is completed (0056-0059). In other words, the status is monitored to determine the progress of the print job, and then that status is displayed on the list.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Vanderlinden teaches the submission of a print job over a network to a reproduction center using a form displayed on a web browser (0040-0047).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not currently represented in this database--* (0059-0060).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not*

currently represented in this database—such as the addition of new printers—*services not available on the network and services database and updating the database with the new printer* added to the reproduction center (0051, 0059-0060).

Claims 9, 11-14, 17-18 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claims 1-5, and 7-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Vanderlinden discloses the use or query of a device capability store—*database of known services--* for automatically updating the submission form to include a description outlining change in devices capabilities. This invention also indicates the print status of printers, whether or not a print job is being printed or is completed (0056). Vanderlinden fails to explicitly disclose: *querying the document production devices*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have query the printers for their status, because this provides the benefit of quickly informing the user of the condition of a print job, so that the user would take necessary steps in case of a malfunction or printer error.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Vanderlinden discloses the use or query of a device capability store—*services database --* for automatically updating the submission form to include a description outlining change in devices capabilities. The device capability store is also used for routing the documents to be printed (0051, 0059, fig.3). Vanderlinden fails to

Art Unit: 2178

explicitly disclose: *querying the document production devices*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have query the printers for their status, because this provides the benefit of quickly informing the user of the condition of a print job, so that the user would take necessary steps in case of a malfunction or printer error.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure Keane et al. (USPub. # 2004/0003342), and Keane et al. (Pat. # 6,650,433).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5543**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:


Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2178

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



CESAR B PAULA

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2178

8/3/04